

Appl. No. 10/773505
Reply to Office action of 9/20/2005
Page 5

REMARKS

Claims 1, 7 and 9 have been amended. Claim 1-10 remain pending.
Reconsideration and reexamination of the application are requested.

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 9, and 10 under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated Patton.

Patton discloses at column 3, lines 49-64 the following:

In FIGS. 5 and 6 there are shown the two positions of the planter machine 20 as operated by a three point hitch 86 having connecting rods 88 and pivot members 90, 92 on either side thereof and operating by hydraulic action to allow the machine 20 to be raised to an inoperative position as shown in FIG 5, or for the machine 20 to be lowered to the operating position as shown in FIG. 6.

In FIGS. 7 and 8 there is shown the equipment which allows the weight of the machine 20 to be distributed so as to shift the weight either to the rear planting coulters 26, as shown in FIG. 7, or to the forward cutting coulters 24, as shown in FIG. 8. This equipment includes a turnbuckle 96 connected between the tractor and a pair of brackets 98 mounted at the upper end of frame member 66.

That is, Patton discloses a "three point hitch". The three point hitch provides for raising and lowering the entire machine 20 and then also for shifting weight between forward and rearward coulters. Patton is not directed to an implement as claimed in claims 1, 7, and 9 and the claims which depend from them. That is, claims 1, 7, and 9 are directed to an agricultural implement "for being pulled by a powered vehicle". Each of the implements as required by the claims has a tow bar assembly wherein the implement is pulled by the powered vehicle. Patton does not disclose a tow bar assembly such that an implement can be pulled. Patton discloses a three point hitch. They are very different structure. Patton does not anticipate claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 9 and 10.

The Examiner rejected claim 6 under 35 USC 103(a) as being obvious on consideration of Patton in view of Javerlhac. Claim 6 depends from claim 4 which depends from claim 1. Applicant does not acquiesce in the independent rejection of claim 6, but it is not necessary to further distinguish claim 6 at this time.

Appl. No. 10/773505
Reply to Office action of 9/20/2005
Page 6

Applicant acknowledges the allowability of claims 3 and 8.

In view of the above, it is submitted that the application is now in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and reexamination are requested. Allowance of claims 1-10 at an early date is solicited. Any questions regarding this communication can be directed to the undersigned attorney, Curtis B. Hamre, Reg. No. 29,165 at (612) 455-3802.



Dated: December 13, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

HAMRE, SCHUMANN, MUELLER &
LARSON, P.C.
P.O. Box 2902-0902
Minneapolis, MN 55402-0902
(612) 455-3800

By: Curtis B. Hamre
Curtis B. Hamre
Reg. No. 29,165
CBH/lad